

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).
Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50.
Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918

VOL. XXIII, No. 10

MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1930

WHOLE No. 621

The Macmillan Classical Series

THE TITLES

- ELEMENTARY LATIN,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.40
- NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.40
- SECOND LATIN BOOK, *Revised*,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.68
- SECOND LATIN BOOK, *To be Replaced by the Revised Edition*,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.68
- THIRD LATIN BOOK,
Ullman, Henry, and White, *In Preparation*
- PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN,
Ullman and Smalley, \$.80
- EASY LATIN PLAYS,
Lawler, \$.80

EASY LATIN PLAYS

By LILLIAN B. LAWLER

TWENTY plays which meet the need known to every teacher of the first two years of Latin for plays of "made Latin" not submerged in technical difficulties. The subject matter deals with Rome. The vocabulary is simple, and the constructions adapted to sight reading. Ample directions for staging and costuming, as well as numerous illustrations showing scenes as given by the author's pupils, make it easy to produce the plays as well as to read them.

PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN

By ULLMAN AND SMALLEY

HERE is an entirely new book of tests based on the "everlasting fundamentals" of Latin teaching. The tests cover all phases of Latin study: vocabulary, forms, syntax, pronunciation, comprehension, word study, derivative work, Roman civilization. In tablet form with perforated sheets.

Straightening and Shortening the path of Latin study

Elmer: LATIN GRAMMAR

THIS BOOK eliminates many of the difficulties of Latin grammar as usually taught by simplifying and clarifying the subject and adhering firmly to fundamental principles of pedagogy. It is a time- and energy-saver. \$1.48

A Latin teacher wrote to the author:

"I have been comparing your grammar with others and finding it in every respect a marked improvement. By removing many unnecessary obscurities found in the older grammars you lift a great burden from the teaching of Latin in Secondary Schools. For the first time we can equip pupils with a grammar which is not only accurate and adequate but is also delightfully clear and attractive".—Mr. KOWER MILLS, The Loomis School, Windsor, Conn.

New York
Boston
Chicago

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Dallas
Atlanta
San Francisco

WHY LATIN I

LATIN I by *Pearson, Lawrence and Raynor* is a textbook for progressive teachers who are not altogether satisfied with previous results of teaching Latin to first year students. It follows the recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation but it does this in a way all its own. Though it lays a firm foundation for the later study of Latin, it places particular emphasis upon the historical-cultural aspect of the study, the development of an ability to read Latin as Latin, and the relation of Latin to English.

There is a close unity of organization in LATIN I. A characteristic lesson centers in a nucleus—the connected Latin passage of the chapter. All the preparatory, derivative, and drill work is intimately connected with the central theme upon which the chapter is focused.

The reading lessons are closely connected in thought and play an important part in the instruction. The illustrations are closely correlated with the text.

Pearson, Lawrence and Raynor's LATIN I. \$1.40

Teachers' Manual and Key, \$1.20

By HENRY CARR PEARSON, formerly Principal, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, Columbia University, LILLIE MARIA LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Latin Department, and NINA FRANCES RAYNOR, Instructor in Latin, both of the Horace Mann School for Girls.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 10

MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 1930

WHOLE No. 621

* TEACHERS OF LATIN AND LATIN TEACHING¹

Above all else, it is the teacher who determines the success or the failure of instruction in Latin. This fact is being recognized more and more every day as instruction desirably tends away from the too frequent memoriter type of work and looks toward the development of interest, of complete understanding, and of power and ability to read and to translate Latin successfully.

To my mind the first qualification of a teacher of Latin is that indefinable something which we call personality. In its essence, personality is an inborn gift, but it can not be denied that constructive supervision and helpful suggestions will materially assist any teacher to improve his classroom manner. I mention personality first because no teacher, no matter how thoroughly he has been trained, can accomplish good results unless he controls his class. Neither do I deny that, the more thoroughly trained a teacher is and the more knowledge he has of subject matter, the less likely it is that control of a class will be difficult for him in spite of a somewhat negative personality. As a matter of fact, personality and thorough training are probably two coordinate requisites that go hand in hand; one does not precede the other. To-day *new* teachers are increasingly securing more thorough College training for their chosen profession. Teachers now in service are constantly trying to improve themselves professionally, for they realize that they can not succeed unless they have thorough training, and the real love for the subject that comes only through superior preparation.

The third qualification of a successful teacher is a reasonable knowledge of methods and technique. Equipped with a thorough knowledge of subject matter, although not of methods, some are by a natural gift splendid teachers. On the other hand, with Cicero (*Pro Archia* 15) I believe that, when to natural gifts theoretical training is added, then, and then only, we may expect truly remarkable results.

I am indebted to the Educational Measurements Bureau of the New York State Department of Education for a statistical study of the training, distribution, and the most common subject groups taught by teachers of Latin in New York State outside of New York City. Although we did not have statistics for every teacher, the returns were almost complete.

This study was undertaken at my request with a view to the making of recommendations regarding the licensing and the training of new teachers of Latin, in order that it might be assured that pupils in New York State who studied Latin should invariably have teachers with adequate preparation. Whether it will be possible to insist that teachers of Latin shall have

had in College a major in Latin I am unprepared to say. Would-be teachers of modern foreign languages are required to pass a written and an oral State examination which in practical effect demands that the candidates shall have had in College a major, or, at the very least, a minor, in the modern foreign language. Teachers of Latin should have at least a minor in Latin, and, if it proves possible to work the matter out for the smaller Schools, it seems wise that they should have a major in Latin, exactly as the teachers of French have a major in French. Probably the greatest difficulty with the instruction in Latin, particularly in the smaller Schools, is the assignment to this subject of teachers who have not been adequately prepared.

TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF LATIN IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT SIZES

An examination of the statistical study to which I referred above shows that there are 978 teachers of Latin in New York State outside of New York City. Of these teachers 880 are graduates of Colleges, 16 attended College but were not graduated, 82 did not attend College. In percentages this means respectively 90%, 2%, and 8%.

Of the 978 teachers of Latin, 428 had in College a major in Latin, 138 a major in French, 103 a major in English, 70 a major in Social Studies, 181 had a minor in Latin, 151 a minor in French, 133 a minor in Social Studies, 146 a minor in English. The rest are scattered, so far as their major interests in College were concerned.

Although there is no definite basis for comparison, I am inclined to believe that, since 44% of the teachers of Latin had in College a major in Latin, and 19% a minor, or, in other words, since 609 teachers out of 978 had in college a major in Latin or a minor in Latin, Latin is not in a serious condition as compared with other subjects generally.

Our statistics show that 437 teachers, or 45%, have taken Summer Session courses or courses in extension work. I have the feeling that in some other subjects the percentage will probably run over 50. Teachers in the cities have done more of this work than those in High Schools in the villages or in the Supervisory Districts. By High Schools in Supervisory Districts we mean High Schools in which the Principal is technically subordinate to a District Superintendent. The number of teachers who have done work in Summer Sessions is, in the cities, from 60% to 65%, in villages 48%, and in Supervisory Districts only 34%. This last figure may be accounted for by the fact that these teachers are usually recent graduates from College who have not yet felt the need for additional study, and who have possibly not yet accumulated the means.

It is interesting also to note that only 56 teachers, or less than 6%, of this group of 978 Latin teachers have

¹This paper was read at the Twenty-third Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Baltimore City College, May 3-4, 1929.

the degree of Master of Arts. There are scarcely any holders of higher degrees.

We find that 11% of the teachers are graduates of Normal Schools, and 96% graduates of High Schools; 35 teachers, or 4%, are not graduates of High Schools but have equivalent educational qualifications.

Of the teachers who had in College a major in Latin 23% are teaching Latin only. Wherever a teacher gives instruction in a combination of subjects, the subject to which he gives the greatest part of his time is considered the first subject, the subject to which he gives the next largest amount of time the second subject, etc. Using this criterion, we find that 18% are teaching Latin as a first subject, 5% are teaching Latin as a second subject. This makes a total of 423 teachers of Latin, or only 44%, engaged in teaching the subject which is, presumably, of major interest to them and for the teaching of which they are best qualified. It would be interesting to know why this percentage is so small. Of the teachers who had in College a minor in Latin 5% are teaching Latin only, 8% are teaching Latin as a first subject, 5% are teaching Latin as a second subject. This makes a total of 181 teachers, or 19%.

It is most striking, however, and a matter of real concern to note that there are 370 teachers giving some instruction in Latin who had in College no major or minor course in Latin. Of these 370 teachers, 85, or 23%, are teaching nothing but Latin in the cities, 148, or 40%, are teaching Latin as a first subject, 137, or 37%, are teaching Latin as a second subject. These 370 teachers, or 38% of the whole number of teachers of Latin, have had, I repeat, in College, no major in Latin, no minor in Latin. This fact certainly deserves most serious consideration; it may account somewhat for the poor results which we find, particularly in the smaller Schools where teachers without adequate preparation are assigned to teach certain subjects, and where these teachers are further hampered by inexperience.

Looking at the State as a whole, we find that 95 teachers of Latin, or 10%, are in the larger cities, 68, or 7%, in second-class cities, 154, or 16%, in third-class cities, 115, or 12%, in villages, 546, or 56%, in Supervisory Districts. This is evidence that the situation in the Supervisory Districts needs very careful attention.

Only 6% of the teachers of Latin in the State are engaged in teaching Latin in the Junior High School. This seems to indicate the advisability of offering Latin in the Junior High School to a greater extent than at present, at least *where suitable teachers are available, and where this programme will not interfere with the effectiveness of the regular elementary work of the Eighth Grade*. Such a policy, however, is probably inadvisable, as a rule, in the smaller Schools and in the Supervisory Districts.

COMBINATIONS OF SUBJECTS TAUGHT BY TEACHERS OF LATIN

Where Latin is taught as a first subject (that is, as the subject to which the teacher gives the greatest amount of his time), 153 teachers teach French as a

second subject, 80 Social Studies as a second subject, 68 English as a second subject, 43 mathematics as a second subject. The last of these is very surprising as a combination with Latin. Where Latin is taught as the second subject, French, English, and Social Studies occur, in the order named, as first subjects. Unfortunately we have available no figures for French showing what the situation is in the case of those teachers who teach French as a first subject and Latin as a second subject. This to my mind would prove very interesting, particularly in the light of the more stringent qualifications required for the licensing of teachers of French in New York State.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF LATIN

It is gratifying to see that 660, or 68%, of the teachers of Latin have had courses in methods of teaching Latin, and that 401, or 42%, have had practice teaching. It is my hope that, with the eventual introduction of new license requirements, teachers will be required to have had special courses in methods of teaching Latin before beginning their teaching of that subject, and that a high percentage will have the opportunity for practice teaching.

As a result of this study of the qualifications of teachers of Latin in New York State, my personal feeling is that in the near future candidates for a license to teach Latin in the Senior and the Junior High Schools of the State should be graduates of approved Colleges or Universities, should meet general license requirements, and should have earned special credit in approved institutions of collegiate grade in various courses, as follows: a major in College Latin courses, comprising at least 24 semester hours; psychology, 6 semester hours; history and principles of education, 6 semester hours; methods of teaching Latin, 6 semester hours, divided as follows—special methods in Latin, 2 semester hours, professionalized subject matter, 2 semester hours, practice teaching or observation, 2 semester hours. If practice teaching or observation is impossible, two additional semester hours should be offered in professionalized subject matter. This is suggested as a minimum requirement. Although Greek is not indicated as a mandatory requirement, it is highly desirable that every teacher of Latin should have a knowledge of Greek.

As I have just stated, this is a purely personal view for which I assume all responsibility. The requirements for a license in New York State are under the jurisdiction of the Division of Teacher Training, and a committee is now working with this division and considering the matter of desirable changes in the whole field of licenses. I realize thoroughly the problem that confronts any higher institution in its effort to provide prospective teachers of Latin with the solid foundation of knowledge of subject matter that is the first essential for a good teacher. I realize also how difficult it is, except in institutions primarily devoted to the training of teachers, to include the general courses in education which are even now being required. In view, however, of the large number of teachers who appear to have been able to satisfy

these general educational requirements, in psychology, history, and principles of education, what I propose does not seem an exorbitant demand.

Concerning courses in special methods of teaching Latin, I may say that it seems thoroughly feasible to devote two semester hours to a general course that will include a survey of the present status of Latin, an examination of objectives of the teaching of Latin, a study of the General Report of the Investigation conducted by the American Classical League, and an examination of recent literature in the field of Latin. Such a course should consider also general principles of content and method in the light of new objectives, tests of new types, equipment, books, and the special problems of teaching and procedure that pertain especially to first-year work. It should consider also certain professional matters, such as study, travel, magazines, and membership in Classical Associations.

Courses in professionalized subject matter should include the study of at least typical portions of the *specific* works of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil that are usually included in a High School course in Latin. Such a course should deal with contents, background, and related material considered from the standpoint of the practical problems of a prospective teacher. This should save many pupils from mistakes made by ineffective new teachers and should aid the teachers themselves materially by shortening the period of trial and error.

Practice teaching and observation of classes in Latin should enable the teacher to do more effective work from the start. For that reason they seem highly desirable. Many institutions, however, find this work difficult to offer. In such cases two additional hours of preparation in professionalized subject matter seem highly desirable. It might be wise to have separate courses of two semester hours each covering the works of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil, with possibly some selections from Ovid in connection with the study of Vergil. If only two courses of this sort are possible in addition to the special course in methods covering primarily the work of the first year, it is suggested that one course be devoted to the works of Caesar, because of the relatively larger number of pupils involved, and that the other course combine some of the more typical portions of the third-year and the fourth-year authors. In case practice teaching or observation is available, it does not seem possible in a two semester hour course to do otherwise than attempt a very rapid study of the works of the three authors usually read in the last three years of the High School course.

The ideal preparation would, of course, require four years of College work in Latin for a thorough and sound foundation in subject matter, and would postpone the meeting of special pedagogical requirements and the taking of special courses in methods and professionalized subject matter to a year of graduate work. This should be our ultimate goal. It would mean, in effect, the requirement of the Master of Arts degree for all teachers; this is, as yet, impossible of accomplishment. In view of the increasing supply of High School teachers, however, it may not be as far in the future as

one might think. It is a "consummation devoutly to be wished", but we must make haste slowly, and have regard particularly for the smaller schools, which can not afford to employ the trained specialists called for by the requirement we should like to set up as a condition precedent to obtaining a license to teach Latin.

Thus far we have been considering primarily the subject of teachers of Latin. It will now be of interest to consider the present status and practice in the teaching of Latin.

Progressive Schools, especially the larger, are extending their curriculum offerings and are no longer compelling so many pupils of less than average ability to struggle through two years of Latin. Pupils of average or better than average ability can profitably study Latin; for them, probably, it should be the first foreign language studied. For pupils of less ability great good will come of a short introductory course in Latin in the Eighth Grade with emphasis upon by-products, even though the subject is not continued. Teachers are now making the study of Latin much more interesting by using stories of heroes, word-study, history, and other material that makes Latin seem more real. This is highly desirable. At the same time it must be remembered that the pupils are studying *Latin* and that the tail must not wag the dog. The simplification of vocabulary, forms, syntax, and the reduction in amount of reading have but one purpose—to permit thorough mastery of the essentials that remain. This means in the first year a real command of these fundamentals, with at least 90% efficiency, if the pupil is to read Latin readily without haphazard guessing. A command of essentials will afford time for the study of contents, background, and allied material—study that is necessary, but is too frequently omitted.

The teaching of Latin is in a state of flux and change at the present time. Desirable objectives are before the teachers as never before. A new educational philosophy has entered the conservative stronghold. Methods of teaching are changing. Sane progressiveness should be our watchword. The best of the new should replace the worst of the old. We must, however, never forget that the real test of the new methods will be the character of the results achieved through their use.

The question is frequently asked, 'Will pupils find the classical Latin, especially in their examinations, more difficult under the new methods?' This may be the case, if the teacher has not considered his problem carefully; it *should not* be the case if the teacher has planned well and retained a sane balance in methods, materials, and objectives. Interest is a vital *means*, but not an *end*, of Latin teaching. The reading and the comprehension of classical Latin are the immediate goals of the study of Latin, that we may learn about the Romans through their literature. The parts of classical literature commonly read do not embrace the everyday life of the people as do the works read in the study of modern foreign languages. Part of the value of the great works of the classical literatures is their aloofness from the everyday life that is familiar to us. An everyday-life Latin vocabulary is not so essential for reading the works of Caesar, Cicero, or

Vergil; a Latin vocabulary must, rather, be literary, with a definite literary aim in view. Non-essentials that do not contribute directly and worthily to the reading, understanding, and appreciative translation of classical Latin are of doubtful value. We can not afford to teach Latin primarily for its by-products: only to have our enemies say, 'But why call it Latin?'

As there are definite cycles in history and in the stock market, so the teaching of Latin progresses by cycles. There is a periodic feeling of dissatisfaction that comes upon teachers in every field. There is a tendency always to seek something new; frequently, however, the seeker is obliged to discard what he 'discovers' as no more effective than the old. In the present age, we hear much discussion regarding aims and objectives. Is it not possible that these aims and objectives, although not voiced so loudly, were just as prominent in the eyes of the better teachers of an older day as they are at the present time?

To-day we have a host of children in our public High Schools of whom probably 50% at least would not have attended High School fifteen or twenty years ago. In the smaller Schools the curriculum has not been changed to meet their needs. There is a great demand for work that these pupils can do without the stigma of failure and the tendency to leave School which failure creates. The usual panacea suggested is vocational work. Where such work can be supplied, it would seem desirable. It is possible to teach no greater lesson than the dignity and the glory of manual labor, honestly and skillfully done—work such as the guilds fostered many years ago. Would it not be better to provide work other than Latin for pupils who do not possess language ability, and in Latin still hold to those high standards which have for ages past made Latin such an effective instrument of education than to lower the standards in Latin for the sake of the many pupils who would probably be better off somewhere else than in a class in Latin?

Although I might be expected to advocate Latin for all the children of all the people and to glory in an enormous enrolment, I am becoming more and more convinced that Latin should be retained in the Secondary School particularly for the benefit of pupils of average ability or of superior ability who can do the work well. If Latin has to thrive purely upon the pleasure which a mediocre pupil takes in the class and thus has to depend largely for its justification and its continuance upon the study of English derivatives, the reading of exciting biographies, the making of posters, the collection of advertisements, and upon glimpses of the quaint manners and customs of the Roman people, it seems to me that this is the beginning of the end for Latin as Latin.

The primary immediate objective of the study of Latin is the increasing ability to read and to translate Latin; by Latin here, it seems to me, must be meant the classical Latin which has stood the test of time. Only from the study of classical Latin and from a thorough grasp of the essentials and related material that make this study both pleasant and profitable can pupils obtain the benefits that should accrue to them;

otherwise, most of the so-called ultimate objectives, such as work in derivation, background, contents, and social values might better be secured from reading in the vernacular. Such reading would probably accomplish better results in those particular fields, and in a much shorter space of time.

If Latin is taught by *competent* teachers without sacrifice of thoroughness in the fundamental elementary subjects, I advocate the teaching of Latin in the Eighth Grade. For pupils who will assuredly enter College the work in the Eighth Grade may well be a unit of the regular first two years of Latin work, but it should be an enriched course with a slower rate of progress; for pupils of uncertain ability who want to study Latin the course should probably be introductory and exploratory with time equivalent to five periods per week for a half-year assigned as the minimum. These courses afford the logical place to make Latin interesting and valuable, even though the study is not long continued. Both these courses should lay a proper foundation for later work. Pupils in the exploratory course need more of the Latin by-products than is needed by the other group. Both groups need to study English grammar and mythology, to gain a glimpse of Roman life, and, last but not least, to read some real Latin. The College group will need *more* real Latin; the other group needs enough Latin to keep the course from being a Latin-in-English course disguised. The College group will probably have to continue as a homogeneous group through the first two years of High School Latin. The members of the exploratory group might well begin the study of Latin anew in the Ninth Grade if they have shown that they can and will do the work well. This procedure eliminates pupils who will not profit by Latin, at a time far more advantageous to them and to the School than the present system of elimination in the first year, which throws schedules and individual plans into such confusion. Those who go on will be better prepared; those who, should they continue, would probably fail will have been convinced of it by the only test that they can recognize, namely, trying it out for themselves. This Eighth Grade Latin seems to me to be the only means—except more competent teaching—of keeping up the enrolment in Latin at a satisfactory figure.

HAROLD G. THOMPSON

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
ALBANY, NEW YORK

VERGIL'S TREATMENT OF TREES IN THE AENEID

The first step toward an understanding of Vergil's treatment of trees is to recognize that the climate of the region where the poet was born and spent his boyhood differs radically in type from the climate of the region where he spent his later life. The former is the Po plains type, the latter is the true Mediterranean.

The true Mediterranean climate may be summarized in four words, 'green winters, brown summers'. The rainfall has a strongly marked periodicity, with drouth

<The reader may consult, with much profit, an interesting paper by Mr. Valentine, entitled Vergil, Aeneid 5.2, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 21.107-108. See especially the second full paragraph in column 2 of page 107. C. K.>

or semi-drouth in the hot season. The rainfall for the three summer months is less than ten per cent. of the annual total. The hot season is not only nearly rainless but also nearly cloudless; the normal July sunshine in some places reaches the amazing total of 340 hours. The Po plains climate is a modification of the Central European type; the rainfall distribution is quite different from that of the Mediterranean type: the summers have more rain than the winters².

The bearing of this on tree-growth is obvious. Free growth of trees requires heat and moisture at the same time. Where the hot season is dry and the wet season is relatively cold, tree-growth is checked and stunted; but, where the hot season has an adequate amount of rainfall, there is no climatic barrier to the luxuriant growth of trees.

Vergil's treatment of trees is exactly what we should expect from a sensitive nature-lover who spent his boyhood among big trees and then moved to a region where trees were stunted. As we read the Aeneid, the impression grows on us that he is showing not only a liking but also a positive home-sickness for the luxuriant trees of his youth. They seem to be the objects that spontaneously come to his mind when the emotional strain of the story becomes especially acute. The tragic story of Priam's death is prefaced by the mention of the ancient laurel that overshadowed the huge altar in the palace court-yard (2.512-514). In the flight from Troy, which resulted in the loss of Creusa, the rendezvous was an ancient cypress (2.713-716). When Aeneas experienced that magnificent inversion of Elisha's vision (2 Kings 6.13-17), and saw the gods in person tearing up his beloved city by the roots, he compared the fall of Troy to the fall of an aged ash tree which was hacked with axes until it gave a dying groan and crashed down the mountain side (2.624-631). When Aeneas is staggering under the stress of the conflict between loyalty to his heaven-imposed mission and a natural longing to spare Dido's feelings, he is compared to a strong tree buffeted by roaring winds (4.441-449). The end of Aeneas's wanderings was to be marked by oak trees on a river bank (3.390). The path by which he was to find his way to the other world lay through the woods (6.131, 179)³. Beyond the threshold was the Tree of Dreams, a huge elm (6.282-284). The last meeting of Aeneas and Dido ends with Dido's tempestuous departure to join Sychaeus in a shady wood (6.473).

²The essential differences between the two types are given as follows by W. G. Kendrew, *The Climates of the Continents*, 244, 249-250 (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1922): "...For the most luxuriant vegetation heat and moisture must be present at the same time. In the Mediterranean the hot season is rainless and most of the plant growth has to be effected in a comparatively cool season. ... The trees are of less noble proportions than those of both Central Europe to the north and the tropics to the south. ... The Po plains are akin to Central Europe rather than the Mediterranean in climate. ... The rainfall is more evenly distributed over the year than in the rest of the Mediterranean lands, and, in opposition to the régime elsewhere, the summer half-year has more rain than the winter half."

³This is pointed out by T. R. Glover (*Virgil*, 15 [London, Methuen and Co.]; see also page 15 in the second edition [New York, The Macmillan Company, 1912]): "...The wood with its crowded life and strange silence appealed to him, as we can see again and again in his poetry. To take a striking instance, he sends his hero to find his way to the other world by another route from that of Odysseus. The Greek hero sailed there over the sea; the Trojan passed through the woods—
tenent media omnia silvae (A. vi. 131)—..."

As we read these passages, we can hardly help feeling that Vergil not only loved trees but also missed them; he was looking back with longing to beloved objects which had been plentiful in his former environment but were scarcer in his present environment.

Two other points deserve notice.

(1) Slow growth is a marked characteristic of trees in a region where the heat and the moisture come at different times of the year. It can hardly be an accident that Vergil, in describing trees so often says 'old' when he evidently means 'big'. Examples are *veterima laurus* (2.513), *antiqua cupressus* (2.714), *antiquam ornem* (2.626), *annoso validam robore quercum* (4.441). An apparent exception is *ingentis ornos* (6.182); but, as will be seen later, in that passage *montibus* suggests summer rain, and therefore great age would not be so necessary for great size.

(2) It can hardly be an accident that so often, when Vergil introduces trees, he adds a hint explaining the possibility of their occurrence. In 2.513, the tree was in the palace court-yard; artificial watering suggests itself. But in 2.714, where also artificial watering is needed to explain the tree, the explanation does not suggest itself. So Vergil suggests it in the following line; *servata* refers to *cupressus*: it was *the tree* that had been so carefully tended for years. The tree mentioned in 2.626 was on a mountain side; Vergil will not end the passage without inserting *iugis* (631) to indicate the location. Being on a mountain side, the tree would have orographic rain even in summer. Orographic rain also is the explanation of the big trees of 6.182; the word *montibus* makes that clear. Misenus lay dead on the sea shore; but the Trojans went to the mountains to get big trees for the burial ceremonies. The trees in 3.390 are explained by *litoreis*; being on a river bank, they would not lack water even in summer. The trees in the lower world are explained by the general dampness of that region.

HIGH SCHOOL, HENDERSONVILLE,
NORTH CAROLINA

T. W. VALENTINE

REVIEW

Warfare. A Study of Military Methods from the Earliest Times. By Oliver Lyman Spaulding, Jr., Colonel, Field Artillery, United States Army; Hoffmann Nickerson, Formerly Captain, United States Army; John Womack Wright, Colonel, Infantry, United States Army. With a Preface by General Tasker H. Bliss. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. (1925). Pp. xiii + 601. 36 Plates. The contents of the book entitled *Warfare, A Study of Military Methods from the Earliest Times*, in so far as they are of special interest to students of the Classics, are as follows:

Part I. Ancient Warfare: To the Death of Julius Caesar, By O. L. Spaulding, Jr. (3-187); I. Introduction (3-9), II. The Early Oriental Monarchies (10-34), III. Greece: The Trojan and Persian Wars (1200-479 B. C.), The Freedom of the Dardanelles (35-53), IV. Greece: The Peloponnesian War and After (469-369 B. C.), The Athenian Empire (54-74), V. Macedon (370-180 B. C.) (75-100), VI. Rome: The Kingdom and the Early Republic (750-216 B. C.) (101-126); VII. Rome: The Later Republic (215-60 B. C.) (127-157), VIII. Caesar (158-184), Bibliography (185-187). Part II. Warfare in the Roman Empire, The Dark

and Middle Ages: to 1494 A. D. <in that year field artillery was introduced by Charles VIII in his Italian Campaign>, by Hoffman Nickerson (189-411), I. The Imperial Roman Army (From Augustus to Hadrian—29 B. C. to 117 A. D.) (191-218), II. The Imperial Roman Army (From Hadrian to the Death of Constantine—117-337 A. D.) (219-243), III. The Imperial Roman Army (From the Death of Constantine to the Death of Justinian—337-565 A. D.) (244-265), IV. The East-Roman Army After the Death of Justinian (575-1079 A. D.), And the Dark Ages in the West, 451-1000 (266-289).

The remainder of the work, covering the period down to the end of the wars of Frederick the Great, need not concern us here.

This is a lucid, stimulating, and informative book, most accurately printed, and attractively set up. The authors exhibit a very lively sense of actuality which contrasts favorably with the formal and somewhat unreal presentations of this subject by the ordinary philologist and historian. In general, this imaginative reconstruction of the real conditions of warfare, a reconstruction based upon personal experience in campaigning, gives also a heightened respect for ancient achievement. Particularly salutary in this connection is the well-justified admiration for the Byzantine army and the way in which it set about its difficult tasks, in contrast with the widespread tendency which has prevailed to belittle and disparage everything in that age of slow decline. Stirring, too, is the generous and well-deserved praise of Xenophon (67-71). On the other hand, the relative insignificance of the battle of Tours from the point of view of military tactics is very properly emphasized (283-284). Much the same thing is true of the Peloponnesian War (see especially 58). It seems at first a bit strange that the age when, by common consent, the minds of men are believed to have been most preternaturally active, should have achieved almost nothing new in this field of endeavor.

Somewhat similar is the case of Caesar¹. With all the respect which these authors, and every one who really studies his character and achievements must have for him, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to ascribe to him any important innovation either in strategy or in tactics. This may be explained, perhaps, by the wonderful quality of the instrument that he handled, which made it unnecessary in actual fighting to do more, once the preliminaries were out of the way and contact with the enemy was established, than to attack furiously head on against any odds. Of course the morale of his men was largely created by his own personality and intelligence, and I would not for a moment detract from the credit of his achievement in this direction, for the production of a morale like that of Caesar's men is very likely a more difficult and remarkable thing than the inventions of even an Epaminondas or a Hannibal. If Caesar had had inferior human material as well as inferior numbers, he might well have developed strategy or tactics, for no one would question his ability so to do, but for him it was never necessary. After all, rabbit-shooting does not

require such elaborate preparations as an elephant-drive. But with Athens the case was different. I presume the Athenian lack of inventiveness (except for the two great geniuses, Themistocles and Iphicrates), especially in the Peloponnesian War, was due to the fact that Athens really expected to fight it out not on land, but by sea. Epaminondas, however, without a great navy, simply *had* to beat Sparta on land with inferior numbers. It was fortunate for himself and for Thebes that he had the brains to see how alone it could be done.

To me the most attractive feature in the book under review is the frequency with which the modern parallel is adduced, a procedure which gives a kind of third dimensional vividness to the record. Nowhere is this more effectively done than in the stirring tale (5-7), after Major Vivian Gilbert, of how, in 1918, the British 60th Division won a smashing victory over the Turks in Palestine by consciously employing upon the very same spot, still bearing the same name, that is, Mich-mash, the tactics which Jonathan and his armorbearer had successfully used against the Philistines more than twenty-five centuries before (I Samuel, 13-14).

Thus the book may well be used as collateral reading in ancient history, for almost anyone will get a great deal of information out of it, and even the specialist will not fail to be stimulated occasionally by the crisp statement of interesting views.

But the book is not quite free from blemishes, and it is with the hope that some of these may be considered by the authors in a new edition, which the book surely deserves, that a few are detailed here.

In the first place, the secondary sources cited in the Bibliography are not quite what they should be. Hans Delbrück, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst* (4 volumes, Berlin, 1900-1920), has obviously been followed pretty closely, and, of course, the works of Grundy and Stoffel are standard. But the great articles in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire*, together with the extensive list of shorter articles, admirably brought together, on pages 17-18 of the Index volume, and in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, by Cagnat, Kubitschek, Lammert, Monceaux, Ritterling, and others (especially in the articles *Exercitus*, *Legio*, *Reiterei*, and the like), should not be passed by, for Smith's Dictionary is hardly any more "the standard work of reference on the subject" (187). Besides these, certainly Eduard Meyer's *Das Römische Manipularheer, Seine Entwicklung und Seine Vorstufen, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie*, 1923, reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften*, 2.193-330 (1924), and Paul Coussin, *Les Armes Romaines: Essai sur les Origines et l'Évolution des Armes Individuelles du Légionnaire Romain* (Paris, 1926), are fundamental for the Roman army, and of course Johannes Kromayer's *Antike Schlachtfelder* (4 volumes, 1903-1926) is the only possible starting-point for future studies of this kind (the *Schlachten-atlas* [1922-1926] is the only work of his mentioned by our authors). In particular, a wider acquaintance with the extensive literature on the Battle of Marathon (well presented but recently by Giulio Giannelli, *Come si può Concludere Sulla Battaglia di Maratone*,

¹Here reference may be made to H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions* (Oxford University Press, 1928), reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 23.30-32. C. K. >.

343-348 [Raccolta Lombroso, 1925]), would have given more satisfactory treatment. For history in general Breasted, Olmstead, Meyer, Beloch, DeSanctis, Heitland, Glotz, and the authors of *The Cambridge Ancient History* (though these latter are at times somewhat paradoxical) ought to be cited.

Another defect is the curious restriction of 'Warfare' to land-warfare, which results in the almost total exclusion of naval engagements, many of which, like Salamis, Aegospotami, Lepanto, the defeat of the Armada, and Trafalgar have not merely been 'warfare', but warfare of incalculable historical significance. As one result, the essential grand strategy of Themistocles in the campaign of 480 B. C. is somewhat imperfectly presented. Sulla, too, a genius of very great ability, is but barely mentioned, and the Diadochi are entirely passed over.

There is also an occasional indulgence in *obiter dicta* of a somewhat startling kind, as, for example (239), "the Comitatuses, whose name... is derived from the same root as that from which we get our word 'comrade'...", or (261), "there is no reason for rejecting the date of the foundation of Rome itself in 753 B. C. ..." Questionable also, to my mind, is the high tactical and strategical elaboration of the David and Goliath anecdote (3-4). The Greek war chariot of Homeric times was certainly not "a relic of nomadic days" (37), for the chariot was clearly introduced from the South and the East in Minoan times, and, of course, the Greeks "learned to ride" (*ibidem*) before and not after heroic times. There is no recognition of the phalanx as being originally a 'finger', or 'beam', and the battle front only a certain number of these units in line, as the Homeric battle organization most probably was (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.215). It is most unlikely that Greece was importing food from the Black Sea region as early as the time of the Trojan War (39). The defile of Thermopylae was certainly not "eight or ten miles" long at any time in history (50); it was scarcely, in fact, half that length, by Grundy's survey and my own memory, for I walked the full length of it twice in a fraction of a day. The statement (54) that "on land <Athens> could turn out a force as large as Sparta..." is more than true in one sense and far less than true in another; to call Athens "a most turbulent and fickle democracy" (55) is certainly an overstatement. Historical parallelism is seriously strained in designating (59) the events at "Corfu" (Corcyra) in 434 B. C. "a sort of aggravated Agadir incident". In Chapter IV no recognition is accorded to Thucydides as a military critic, although, I believe, he was not only the first but among the greatest of them all.

The events of Hannibal's first campaigns in Italy (116-126) are related according to the aristocratic tradition which puts all the blame for the misfortunes of Rome upon the leaders of the so-called popular party. This is, I believe, totally erroneous. Scipio in particular made the most serious error of the whole war in not returning to Italy at once, and, with his own army and the troops of Manlius, utterly destroy-

ing, as unquestionably he might have done, the instant they arrived in Italy, those shadows of men and horses which Hannibal brought over the Alps. Flaminius did not act with any extraordinary rashness. Fabius Maximus did more to damage Roman morale by showing plainly that he was afraid of Hannibal than did any commander who lost an army. The Roman tactics at Cannae were characterized by excess of caution rather than by recklessness. The consuls of that year were under express orders to attack Hannibal. The disposition of troops was certainly nothing that could have been improvised at the last moment. Cannae was lost by inferiority in morale more than by anything else; the two ex-consuls in charge of the infantry must bear the principal blame for mishandling their troops. Finally, I believe it to be highly probable that Aemilius Paulus (not Varro) was in command on the day of battle, despite the aristocratic tradition. However, all this requires a separate treatise, which I hope to present in the near future.

"Marius' Mules" (154) may have been the forked sticks on which the baggage was carried (so Festus), but were more likely the soldiers themselves (Plutarch; Cagnat, in Daremberg et Saglio, s. v. *Sarcina*; and others; Frontinus, unfortunately, is not explicit).

"It was midwinter..." by the conventional calendar when Caesar crossed the Adriatic (175), but actually early in November, and it is unlikely that Pompey had fewer men at Dyrrhachium than did Caesar (176), especially in view of Caesar's express statement to the contrary (*De Bello Civili* 3.44-5; see also Drumann-Gröbe, 3.443). That "the besieged" had 340 catapults at Jerusalem in 70 A. D. is a slip (198); the correct statement is given on page 205. To my mind, also, it is not clear that the Roman Wall in Britain might not have been used for repelling a direct assault by unequipped barbarians, as is argued on pages 221-223. It is true that the troops to defend it would have been spread out very thin, with "nearly 4½ yards per man", if one divides the total length of the wall by the total number of defenders, but then, of course, no assault could have been delivered over all 73 miles simultaneously, and at the actual point of attack the concentration could have been as dense as one pleased. Besides, it so happens that, according to the statement on page 406, nine thousand men at Constantinople, in 1453, had 39,000 yards of wall to defend, which gives exactly the same interval per man. But then here, as well as at any assault on the Roman wall in Britain, only a small fraction of the total length had to be defended at any one moment. The Roman wall was probably as good as any *vallum* for a camp, and yet it was very seldom that barbarians stormed a Roman camp successfully, unless the troops had already been demoralized by a defeat in the open field.

But these and other points that might be raised are either easily corrected, or else debatable matters. I wish to conclude with a word of congratulation upon the excellence of the book as a whole, and the wish that it may be widely read and studied.

¹Comitatuses is derived from *com* + *ire*, *comrade* from *camera*.

'THE FORMER' AND 'THE LATTER' IN TRANSLATIONS

One of our stock arguments for the study of the Classics is that such study helps the student to acquire proficiency in English. There are, however, ways in which the study of Latin may injure the student's English if pupil and teacher are not vigilant. One of them is the translation of *ille* and *hic* by 'the former' and 'the latter' in situations where it would be more natural to repeat proper names or common nouns or else to employ some other device. We seldom hear 'the former' and 'the latter' in conversation, but scientific literature abounds in awkward uses of these words¹.

In *De Bello Gallico* 5.44 Caesar describes the intense rivalry in valor of two daring centurions, Titus Pullo and Lucius Vorenus. In sections 9-10 there occur the following sentences: *Succurrit inimicus illi Vorenus et laboranti subvenit. Ad hunc se confestim a Pullone omnis multitudo convertit; illum veruto arbitrantur occisum.* The translation of the pronouns in the second sentence will depend somewhat upon the order of ideas that the translator adopts, but the use of 'the former' and 'the latter' would make a slow-motion picture of a vivid narrative. The repetition of the names is greatly superior to the use of these words. The quotation might be rendered as follows: 'Though his rival, Vorenus rushes to his aid as he still holds out. To Vorenus the entire throng at once turns its attention from Pullo; it thought Pullo² had been killed by a shaft'.

A passage in Cicero, *De Amicitia* 10, . . . *cave Catoni anteponas ne istum quidem ipsum quem Apollo, ut ais, sapientissimum iudicavit, huius enim facta, illius dicta laudantur*, is thus translated by Professor G. M. Lane³, "suffer not Cato to find a rival even in your man himself, whom, as you say, Apollo declared wisest of mankind; for our Cato is renowned for deeds, the other for doctrines".

In Harper's Monthly Magazine 128 (1914), 635, W. D. Howells thus gives vent to his feeling against the words in question: "Why any human being should write 'the former' and 'the latter' when all are at liberty to repeat with distinction the nouns that these pronominal stuffed images stand for, we never could comprehend. . . ."

Dr. Samuel Johnson was not a whit less emphatic in his denunciation of these words⁴: "As long as you have the use of your pen, never, Sir, be reduced to that shift".

There are, of course, many obviously correct uses of 'the former' and 'the latter', both singly and together. The greater effectiveness in general of the repetition of names is clearly seen when the original form of a nursery rime is contrasted with a distorted version:

Jack and Jill went up the hill
To fetch a pail of water;
The former fell down and broke his crown,
The latter came tumbling after.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

¹See, for example, the list made by G. McL. Wood, *Suggestions to Authors of Papers Submitted for Publication by the United States Geological Survey*, 67-68 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1916).

²One might say, simply, 'he'.

³A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges, Revised Edition, § 2354 (New York, American Book Company, 1903). In the same section Professor Lane gives a translation in which *ille* and *hic* are rendered naturally by 'the former' and 'the latter'.

⁴I have taken this quotation at second hand from John O'London, *Is It Good English?*, 14 (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925). On page 13 the author calls effective repetition one of the favorite devices of Mr. Arnold Bennett.

A STRIKING INCONSISTENCY IN WORD-USAGE

Our present stress upon consistency is said to be due in large part to the printer's desire for uniformity. Certainly Chaucer felt no compulsion to abide by the spellings he first used. Printer or no printer, our books, even those with scholarly pretensions, still contain glaring inconsistencies.

I believe that the ancients were more consistent than we are, although they did permit themselves to do things which we regard as inconsistent. For instance, Frontinus in the *Praefatio* to his *Strategemata* makes a shift in the number of a pronoun: *Huic labori non iniuste veniam paciscar ne me pro incurioso reprehendat qui praeteritum aliquod a nobis repererit exemplum.* This change in number was not regarded as objectionable¹. It is not to be compared to the usage of some scientists, who jump from "the present writer" to "the author", to "I", and to "we".

We feel that within a paragraph there should be no shift from the historical present to the tense of narration. Caesar makes such a change within a single sentence in *De Bello Gallico* 1.24.1 *Postquam id animum advertit, copias suas Caesar in proximum collem subducit, equitatumque qui sustineret hostium impetum misit*².

These comments are merely by way of introduction to what looks like a glaring inconsistency of Pliny the Elder in forming the comparative degree of *siccus* in two ways, in his *Naturalis Historia* 2.126-127. After using the form with the suffix twice in one sentence, in the next sentence he employs the positive with *magis*: *Idem <= Vulturinus et Favonius> sub-solano sicciores, et in totum omnes a septentrione et occidente sicciores quam a meridie et oriente. Saluberrimus autem omnium aquilo, noxius auster et magis siccus, fortassis quia umidus frigidior est.*

Was there any stylistic reason for this change? The form *noxius* looks like a comparative³, but is not a comparative. Did Pliny feel an aversion to coordinating an adjective that looks like a comparative form with another adjective that actually has the comparative suffix? When he got farther away from *noxius*, he reverted to the normal formation, in *frigidior*. Would Pliny, were he to come back to life, agree with Emerson's statement, "Consistency is the bugbear that frightens little minds"⁴?

There may be added to this note a witticism of Vespasian which depends for its effect upon the existence of a general feeling for consistency. Mestrius Florus once corrected him for using the plebeian form *plostra* rather than *plustra*. The next day the Emperor greeted him as *Flaurus*⁵.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

¹Compare Tibullus 2.4.5 et seu quid merui seu quid peccavimus, and see K. F. Smith's note on 1.2.11, in *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York, American Book Company, 1913).

²Compare Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1.99. *Quod quidem somnium Sisenna cum disputavisset mirifice ad verbum cum re convenisse, tum insolenter, credo ab Epicureo aliquo inductus, disputat somniis credi non oportere.*

³Harper's Latin Dictionary says of an example of *noxior* from Seneca, *De Clementia* 1.13.2, "dub., al. obnoxior". The form *noxior* appears in the Teubner text of 1874, edited by F. Haase, but not in the 1914 edition, edited by Carolus Hosius.

⁴In T. E. Lawrence's *Revolt in the Desert* (New York, Garden City Publishing Co., 1926) there is a Publisher's Note which states that "the spelling of Arabic names throughout this book varies according to the whim of the author", and explains that expostulation with the author proved of no avail.

⁵Suetonius, *Vespasian* 22.